

information regarding such control signals (see e.g. column 6, lines 10 to 40 of Olmsted). Thus, Olmsted is silent regarding detecting the position of the lever and generating a control signal. The Office Action's assertion that Olmsted discloses this feature is clear error.

Moreover, Olmsted discloses that gears are shifted by moving the shift lever. The shift lever actuates the transmission via a linkage that it is mechanically coupled to. In this context a person skilled in the art would not perceive any need to provide a control signal based on the position of the shift stick (control lever), as due to the mechanical coupling the positions of the lever and the resulting actuating forces are well-defined without the need of control signals.

Although Rosenbaum is not relied upon for the above-quoted features, Rosenbaum cannot cure the above deficiency of Olmsted. Rosenbaum does not show a sensing technology for detecting the position of a control lever, an electric control device or control signals. Therefore, even if the teachings of Rosenbaum and Olmsted should be combined regardless of their technical and functional incompatibilities, as discussed in the prior section, the combination could not lead a person skilled in the art to the subject matter of claim 1.

In addition, Paul (US 1,548,382) and Winsen (US 3,066,032), which are not relied upon by the Office Action, do not disclose features relating to electric signals.

III. Summary

For at least the above reasons, Olmsted and Rosenbaum, individually or in combination, cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to render obvious, the combinations of features recited in independent claim 1. To any extent that Olmsted is even combinable with Rosenbaum and/or Reinecke, a conclusion which Applicants do not concede, no permissible combination of these references can reasonably be considered to have rendered obvious the combination of all of the features positively recited in claims 2-12,

for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly on an allowable base claim, as well as the separately allowable subject matter that these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied references are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jarrett L. Silver
Registration No. 60,239

JAO:JZS/hs

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: July 19, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
